



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

The Garter Robes on the Effigy of Charles II at Westminster Abbey

Citation for published version:

Wilcox, D 2018, 'The Garter Robes on the Effigy of Charles II at Westminster Abbey', *Costume*, vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 163-187. <https://doi.org/10.3366/cost.2018.0067>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.3366/cost.2018.0067](https://doi.org/10.3366/cost.2018.0067)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

Costume

Publisher Rights Statement:

This is an Author's Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Edinburgh University Press in *Costume*. The Version of Record is available online at <https://www.euppublishing.com/doi/10.3366/cost.2018.0067>.

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



The Garter Robes on the Effigy of Charles II at Westminster Abbey

By DAVID WILCOX

In Westminster Abbey there are a number of effigies, some of wax, some of wood, many of which have survived for centuries. Some of these effigies had a significant role in the funeral obsequies that followed the death of a monarch. Others were used simply to memorialise a monarch or a public individual. One such effigy is that of Charles II. In 2016, during the conservation of this figure, there was an opportunity to examine the clothing that survives on this wax effigy. The figure is dressed in the robes of a knight of the Order of the Garter, in ceremonial clothing of the late seventeenth century. This article examines the clothing in some detail, including pattern cutting diagrams, and discusses the garments in relation to known others and to fashions of the period.

Keywords: Charles II, Order of the Garter, Garter robes, ceremonial dress, Westminster Abbey funeral effigies, seventeenth-century tailoring

INTRODUCTION

Among the many artefacts housed at Westminster Abbey, some of the most curious are the funeral effigies. The older, wooden figures of royalty, dating as far back as the fourteenth century, were used during funeral rites as a proxy for the dead monarch. The later seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth century effigies were of wax and were a mixture of royal and national figures. The wax effigy of Charles II (1630-1685) represented a break with tradition; the figure was made specifically for the Abbey, shortly after his death, and was not a funeral effigy.¹ It seems likely that Charles' brother and successor, James II (1633-1701), did not want to make a great public display of Charles II's funeral. The burial was at night and there was no parading of a life-like funeral effigy, dressed in robes of

state, mounted on a hearse, as had formerly been the custom. In his last hours, Charles II had refused the sacrament offered by his Anglican bishops and instead had given his confession to and been administered last rites by a Catholic priest brought secretly to his bedchamber.² James II, also a Catholic, had perhaps thought it politic not to draw too much attention to his brother's problematic deathbed conversion by keeping the burial relatively private, though not secret. Paul Fritz shows that there had been discussions between the officers of arms and James II and that their suggestion of a full heraldic funeral had been rejected by James. He wanted the ceremonials to be done with as 'little charge and expense as possible'. It seems that there was discussion about the making of an effigy, but no action was taken. Instead, the late king was represented by 'an imperial crown of tin gilt with a cap of crimson velvet turned up with ermine', resting on a cushion of purple velvet.³ As Jennifer Woodward suggests, 'the perpetuity of Kingship symbolised by the effigy was clearly no longer appropriate in post-Civil War England'.⁴

Charles II was buried on 14 February 1685, in a vault under the Henry VII Chapel. During his lying-in-state at the Painted Chamber in the Palace of Westminster and at his subsequent funeral procession and burial, there is no record of the use of a funeral effigy. However, an effigy must have been made and set up shortly after his death as there is a record of payment in 1686 for a '*Press for the late Kings Effigies*'.⁵ This was a wainscot cupboard of wood and glass which, until the later displays of the twentieth century, held the effigy of Charles II. There is no surviving documentation around the commissioning and making of the effigy because it would have been ordered and paid for by the men of the choir, the minor canons and the vergers of the Abbey. They earned income from what were in effect guided tours around the Abbey and the funeral effigies were part of this sightseeing attraction. It was for this reason that there are no formal records of the history

and restorations of the effigies, only the little information that survives among the records of the Precentor and the choir.⁶

The effigy remained on display in the Henry VII Chapel at least until 1836 and by 1843 it seems that all effigies, both wooden and wax, monarch or national figure, were locked up in the Upper Islip Chapel. There it remained until the early 1930s when the effigy and clothing were cleaned (and photographed) under supervision of the Victoria and Albert Museum. The return to the Upper Islip Chapel was relatively brief; in 1942 the effigy was disrobed and the figure stored with the other wax figures in the depths of Piccadilly Circus underground station for the remainder of the war (1939-45). In 1951 the effigy was returned to the Abbey and clothed again, using the earlier photographic records for reference, before going on display in the Undercroft Museum.⁷ There were further disturbances in 1966, 1987 and from 2016 to 2018 when new displays were set up and there were opportunities for conservation.⁸ It was during this most recent intervention that it was possible to examine the clothing of the Charles II effigy in some detail and to record its cut and construction which provides the subject of this article (Figure 1). The Charles II effigy was clothed as a Knight of the Order of the Garter and the various elements of this habit will be described in turn and related to the descriptions given in Elias Ashmole's (1617-1692) publication of 1672, *'The Institution, Laws and Ceremonies of the Most Noble Order of the Garter'* (Figure 2).⁹ The clothes will also be discussed in relation to other surviving ceremonial dress from the period, and to male fashions of the late seventeenth century.

PROVENANCE

We do not know how the effigy figure of Charles II was originally dressed as there are no records at the Abbey to provide an account, nor is it known if they are Charles II's clothes

with any certainty. The installation seems to have been set up around 1686. It is known that in January of 1700, there was a break-in at the Abbey when the effigy of Charles II was robbed of some of its regal insignia, the robbers succeeding in carrying off all the ornaments. This was reported in *The Flying Post*, a popular news-sheet of the period.¹⁰ The historian Agnes Strickland (1796-1874) writing of the incident in her *Lives of the Queens of England* says that ‘since the robbery, Charles’s wax statue has been dressed in a dark velvet costume, which was probably one of his old court dresses.’¹¹ The effigy is currently dressed in a dark blue silk velvet mantle, part of the dress of a Knight of the Order of the Garter, and this seems to answer well to Strickland’s description. Although the tradition for royal funeral effigies had been to clothe them in their coronation robes, it may be that because Charles II was so frequently represented in paintings, prints and medals wearing the Garter robes that those were considered more fitting attire.¹² Emily Tennyson Bradley (1862-1946) in her *Annals of Westminster Abbey* comments, of the effigy, that ‘the robes were renewed in the next century, and trimmed with real *point-de-rose* lace’, although she gives no source for this information.¹³

The Garter robes consist of the Mantle, the Surcoat, the Hood and the Cap, and a sword belt and hanger. Alongside that there is the underdress which was introduced by Charles II, consisting of a doublet and trunk hose of cloth of silver.¹⁴ In this case, there is also a pair of silk drawers, a pair of silk stockings, a linen shirt with detachable shirt cuff ruffles, and a lace cravat. A pair of white leather shoes completes the costume.¹⁵ The figure is dressed with a human hair wig, but this was added in 1729, according to Abbey records, replacing an earlier one.¹⁶ An illustration in Dart’s *Westmonasterium* of 1723 (see supplementary material online) shows that the effigy’s appearance has been quite stable since then as it closely resembles the late nineteenth century photographs taken by Benjamin Stone and the twentieth century documentation.¹⁷ The textile objects will be

discussed one by one below, in relation to Ashmole's descriptions and to other surviving garments. Such insignia as were once present – the ornaments removed by the robbers of 1700, perhaps - are completely missing from the present dress of the effigy. Ashmole describes in detail the various badges and precious ornaments that were attached to the dress of a Knight of the Garter on ceremonial occasions; today there are no jewels, no garter, no headband, and no Garter cross badge on the mantle.¹⁸

THE MANTLE (WA 0894.5): Figure 3

The mantle is a large shield-shaped cloak cut from parallel strips of blue silk velvet which are seamed selvedge to selvedge. The width of the silk is 52 cms. This is in line with the silk velvet in the Garter mantle of Charles Stuart (1639-1672), third Duke of Richmond and sixth Duke of Lennox, which survives at Lennoxlove House, and which dates from the period 1661-1672.¹⁹ The difference between these two surviving mantles lies with the amount of velvet employed in their making. There is also quite a subtle difference in the way the front edges have been shaped.

Ashmole states that the quantity of velvet used in both the king's mantle and those of foreign princes, is twenty yards.²⁰ This allows for a train. The 'knights subjects', having lower status, are allowed eighteen yards for the making of a mantle without a train.²¹ He then goes on to give the measurements of the mantle of Charles II: 'The full length of the present Sovereign's Mantle, from the Collar behind to the end of the Train, is 3 yard'.²² Measurement of the Charles II effigy mantle shows this length to be 272 cm which is one inch under nine feet or three yards, the measurement given by Ashmole. This seems to confirm that it is a royal mantle. Equally Ashmole states that 'The length of the foreside 1 yard and 3 quarters': that is 160 cm. Measurement of the effigy mantle is just over 159 cm, again confirming the dimensions of the monarch's mantle.

The neckline is semicircular and this curved edge has been gathered to fit the length of the standing collar, which is also of blue velvet. Its dimensions are 49cm by 7cm. Silk velvet has been pieced together and mounted on to a foundation of unbleached buckram, then lined with white silk taffeta. The outer ends of the velvet collar have been patched over with white silk lining, and buttonholes worked through all the layers. The whole is rather crudely done. These patches of white silk seem to relate to the illustration by Wenceslaus Hollar (1607-1677) which features in Ashmole (Figure 2). There the front edges of the mantle are turned back, showing the white taffeta lining and there is continuity with this on the collar. The two large buttonholes, one on each side of the collar, would have been used to attach the cords (or robe-strings) and tassels. These do not survive, nor is it clear that they were ever present; the illustration of 1723 in Dart's *Westmonasterium* (see supplementary material online) shows no cords, no tassels.²³ But they were a feature of the full dress of a Knight of the Order of the Garter, as is described in Ashmole and can be seen in the engraving of Charles II by William Sherwin (1645-1709: see supplementary material online) and are a clear feature of the many drawings of knights of the Garter made by Sir Peter Lely (1618-1680).²⁴ Ashmole also states that a hook and eye of gold were used to secure the collar, but there are none surviving on the mantle.

Although the mantle was identified with the colour blue, it seems that in Elizabethan times purple was used for the Garter mantles of foreign dignitaries and this colour then came to replace the traditional blue for all knights of the Garter. But during Charles I's reign, the colour was changed back to blue, with the first re-appearance of blue mantles taking place at the installation of the young Charles II, then aged 8 : 'and the first time these Mantles were worn, was to honor the Installation of the present Sovereign'.²⁵

The mantle is lined to the edges with white silk taffeta which has a loom width of 104 cm. There are no facings and only the collar has an interlining. Interestingly, the lining silk, although using the full selvedge width of its component strips, is arranged in a chevroned pattern (Figure 3). As can be seen from the diagram of the mantle, the front edges are not cut at a right angle to the central axis of the mantle, but slope off at a lesser angle. The silk taffeta lining panels pick up this angle and are arranged in a chevron pattern down the centre back. This is a very nuanced use of materials. By contrast, the Lennoxlove mantle of 1616-1672 and two others recorded by Janet Arnold – the mantle presented to King Christian IV (1577-1648) in 1603 and that of Bishop Trelawny (1650-1721) of 1707 – are cut with the front edges at right angles to the central axis.²⁶

On the right hand side of the mantle, a circle of stitch marks on the velvet shows where there was once a large embroidered badge, the Garter gross. The circle has a diameter of 22cm suggesting that the badge on this mantle was larger than the 7 inches mentioned in Ashmole (height 10 in, width 7 in). The Garter gross seems to have been missing for some time as it does not appear in the photographs taken in the 1930s.²⁷ This badge is described by Ashmole: ‘The Garter fixt upon the Mantle of the present Sovereigne, is encompassed with large Oriental Pearl, so also are the Letters of the Motto, and the Cross within the Garter’.²⁸ It also featured in Hollar’s engraving (Figure 2).

THE SURCOAT (WA 0894.6): Figure 4

(Note: Photographs of the surviving surcoat, hood, doublet, trunk hose, drawers and shirt can be found in the supplementary information online.)

The surcoat is a simple, flared coat of red silk velvet, cut using the full loom width of the fabric (55.5 cm) and is not dissimilar to the blue silk velvet used for the mantle, which is equally narrow. The nap of the velvet runs down the coat. The surcoat reaches to the

knees, unlike earlier versions of this garment which had been longer, reaching to the ankles.²⁹ The coat is lined to the edges with white silk taffeta and it has no fastenings. The sleeves are wide and use the full width of the silk velvet and are also lined with white silk taffeta. They are unusual in that they seem to be a survival from the time when hanging sleeves were the norm, in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. However, in this later form, the arm is passed through a gap in the armhole and the sleeve hangs down behind, not over the arm.

The front edges of the coat and the sleeves' open edges have the velvet turned back to form facings which stiffen and reinforce the edges. The silk taffeta lining sits over these turnings and is taken close to the folded edge. The turnings are approximately 1.6 - 1.7 cm deep. It may be that the edges are also reinforced with linen tape – but there is no break in the textiles to be sure of this. The surcoat back is lined with white silk taffeta in one complete piece with no centre back seam, so that the selvedge width of the silk is about twice the width of the velvet (104 cm) and seems to be the same silk taffeta used for the mantle lining. The simple stand collar has a base of buckram over which is folded a strip of velvet.

There are two possible comparisons namely the description in Ashmole, and the pattern cutting information given by Janet Arnold, writing about the kirtle or surcoat of King Christian IV which dates from 1603.³⁰ Ashmole, in this case, is the more contemporary authority: 'But since Velvet came into use, the allowance for Surcoat and Hood [...] hath been eighteen yards; that is, while the Surcoat reached down to the feet, but now it being the fashion to wear it shorter, the allowance is but ten yards.'³¹ Note that Ashmole refers to the earlier style of the surcoat (or kirtle), reaching to the feet. Measurement of the King Christian IV surcoat shows it to have a shoulder to hem length of around 147 cm. In other words, it was ankle length, unlike the surcoat under discussion,

which reaches only to the knee. Ashmole says the combined allowance for both the (shorter) surcoat and hood was 10 yards. The present author calculates that eight of these 10 yards would have been needed for the surcoat and 2 yards for the hood.

Ashmole continues: 'The length of the Sovereign's Surcoat, is one yard and a half; and of the sleeve one yard wanting a Nail.'³² The present surcoat is shorter than the prescribed yard and a half by about 4 inches. A nail is 1/16th of a yard (2 ¼ inches) so that the sleeve length described is 33 ¾ inches. The sleeve length of the present surcoat is 84 cm which seems to be fairly close to the description. The engraving by William Sherwin which forms the frontispiece to Ashmole's account shows Charles II with a surcoat of intermediate length, falling between the knee and the ankle (see supplementary material online). The present surcoat is shorter and therefore more like the surcoats which feature in many portraits of knights of the Garter which date from the last decade of the seventeenth century and the early years of the eighteenth century.

Concerning how the surcoat was worn, it is frequently seen in later seventeenth century portraiture of knights of the Garter to have the front edges turned back to expose the white taffeta linings, held in place by the sword girdle and hanger which is strapped around the waist.³³ This accessory is almost always of a matching red silk velvet.

THE HOOD (WA 0894.7): Figure 5

The hood is a strange object as it seems only to have symbolic function, suggestive of medieval times and the origin of the order. It derives, according to Ashmole, from a medieval hood and streamer or liripipe, a form long out of fashion but somehow surviving in this ceremonial costume. In fact it continues to survive today as part of the dress of a contemporary knight of the Garter. It consists of a central ring of tightly packed fibres, rather like a rope quoit, which is covered with red silk velvet.³⁴ To this is attached a large

flounce of the same velvet, lined with white silk taffeta. The streamer, a long band of velvet lined with white silk taffeta, is also attached to the ring. The hood was worn on the right shoulder, on the outside of the mantle. The streamer lay across the chest, and the end was tucked into the sword girdle. Ashmole has little to say of the hood, except that 'It was heretofore, and now is, generally made of the same materials with the *Surcoat*, and consequently of the same Colour.' The hood is lined 'now with *Taffaty*, as is the Lining of the *Surcoat*; of all which mention is made, in those authorities cited before, and relating to the *Surcoat*.'³⁵

THE CAP (WA 0894.19): Figure 5

The hat, or cap, as it was known, clearly derives from earlier models as it is structured like an Elizabethan or Jacobean hat.³⁶ The cap has a height of 15cm and the widest part, the brim, has a diameter of 29.21 cm. It is made from black velvet, which seems to have been stiffened in some way, perhaps with gum arabic or size, and has been lined with black silk. There appears to be no interlining. The shaping of the crown is quite simple - a large circle of velvet has been pleated around the edges to create a flat circular top and close, pleated sides. There are forty triangular pleats. It should be noted that the effect of the pleats is to make the sides flare out, rather like a latter-day top hat. This effect is quite different from the tapered hats with which it shares techniques of construction and their rather bold appearance was well captured by the artist Sir Peter Lely (1618-1680) in the series of drawings he made of Knights of the Garter at Windsor.³⁷ The brim is stiff, with a base of buckram and both faces are covered in velvet. The velvet for the brim is cut as complete circles; there are no piecing seams, even though this is rather wasteful. The brim is substantial and adds an extra 0.75cm of depth to the hat. Attached to the cap is a piece of card to which are sewn ten white ostrich feathers and an aigrette of narrow black-and-white heron feathers. The aigrette is formed of a length of wire to which hundreds of these

heron feathers have been bound. The splendour of the original can be glimpsed in the portraiture of the time, rather than in the rather tired, dingy plumes which survive.³⁸ There would also have been a hatband attached to the original, and indeed Harvey and Mortimer note that the marks of stitches are visible. They also suggest that the brim was probably caught up to secure the plume when the band was removed. The band is likely to have been a valuable accessory, with some precious metal and jewels in its composition.³⁹

Ashmole records: ‘As to the *Cap*, which in use and place succeeded the *Hood*, we shall briefly say thus much: That it hath been, and yet is made of *Black Velvet*, lin’d with *Taffaty*, but the fashion hath several times varied: for in the Reign of King Henry the Eighth, the Cap was flat [...] In Queen Elizabeth’s time it was a little raised in the head [...] But in King *James* his Reign, they were much more high crown’d; and the present fashion is shewn in our before mentioned *Plate*.’ The cap illustrated in Wenceslaus Hollar’s plate conforms to the style of the present cap (Figure 2).

THE DOUBLET (WA 0894.8): Figures 6 and 7

The doublet is part of the underdress of the ceremonial uniform of a Knight of the Garter. Along with the matching trunk hose, it was introduced by Charles II at the start of his reign.⁴⁰ Ashmole only discusses the history of the mantle, the surcoat, the hood and the cap; there is no mention of the underdress as this seems to have varied with each generation and was not prescribed. It is in the Appendix to Ashmole that we find recorded the king’s wish, in an order of May 1661, to introduce this slightly archaic underdress as a corrective to what he had witnessed at the various Garter ceremonies in the first year of his reign: ‘they followed too much the modern fashion, never constant and less comporting with the decency, gravity, and stateliness of the upper Robes of the Order’.⁴¹ This doublet

is recognisably one that answers to Charles II's wish that it be a short doublet made of cloth of silver.

The two front and two back panels of the doublet as well as the six tabs (or laps) all have an interlining or support of unbleached linen. The sleeves are cut without an interlining. The outer fabric is a cloth of silver, a tabby weave cloth of silk warps and silver wefts. The whole garment is lined throughout with white silk taffeta. The two doublet fronts have extra stiffening in the form of large pieces of linen stiffened with whalebone (baleen) strips. There are seven practical buttons and buttonholes on the upper chest, where the doublet meets edge to edge, but below that, where the front edges slope away, there are none. However the strips of silver lace which are set back from the front edges are further ornamented with small silver passementerie buttons. This pattern of trimming is found also along the sleeve openings; the sleeve pieces are sewn together along the back seam, but the front seam is left open and is only stitched together near the cuff. Both sleeves end in a deep flounce of metal lace and a cluster of ribbons. Some interventions are evident: the centre back bodice seam had an opening 21.6 cms long as was common in mid-seventeenth century doublets, but the seam above this has been split open to the neckline, probably to enable dressing the effigy. The neckline also has an unfinished, raw appearance. Probably, there was once a plain binding of silk braid. Each of the tabs which are attached to the doublet has a row of eyelets worked through the outer fabric and its interlining, but not the silk lining. They are functionless, a hangover from earlier doublets where they fastened to the hose with points. With the Garter underdress of the late seventeenth century, the doublet and hose do not meet and are not laced together; it was fashionable to show a fine linen shirt blousing in this gap.

The doublet style is not only borrowed from an earlier mid-seventeenth century male fashion, but it then remains relatively unchanged through succeeding generations, as a ceremonial item of dress. In this respect, once established, it ceases to follow fashion. The cut of the doublet also gives little away in terms of dating. There is no established typology for this item as there are simply not enough survivals to examine. Two puzzling elements are (1) the cut of the doublet fronts, where they are cut away from the chest to the waist, and (2) the large triangle of stiffening sewn into each front panel. Fashionable short doublets from the mid-seventeenth century have belly pieces inserted, but they are only about half the depth of the centre front length. Why the need to insert such a large panel of whalebone stiffening on each front panel? In all other respects it conforms to the design of a Garter doublet.

The lavish, high-quality metallic bobbin lace used to form ruffles at the sleeve ends has a copper wire base, which had been coated with silver-gilt, now worn through, exposing the copper. Consequently it looks astonishingly fresh. It has a bold Baroque pattern, a design consistent with a date of *c.* 1685. Such metal lace was made in London, so English manufacture is quite possible, although French manufacture is also a possibility.⁴² The silver bobbin lace which is used to outline the doublet and the silver passementerie buttons are also consistent with a date around 1685. The ribbons too, which are formed into bunches and are attached to the sleeve ends, are good examples of late seventeenth century ribbon design and manufacture.⁴³

How does this doublet relate to known others? There are two surviving ceremonial doublets from this period: that of Charles Stuart, third Duke of Richmond and sixth Duke of Lennox and that of James Drummond, fourth Earl of Perth (1648-1716).⁴⁴ Both these doublets are of cloth of silver, with silver lace and silver passementerie buttons and both

have straight front edges (unlike the effigy doublet). In the earlier doublet of Charles Stuart, made around 1665, there are buttons only along the front edge. The present doublet shows the same general pattern of metal lace trimming with additional decorative small buttons that is found in the underdress of the Order of the Thistle (the James Drummond doublet, manufactured somewhere between 1689-1716). Alan Mansfield notes that this pattern continued into the nineteenth century as a feature of the trimming of the cloth of silver doublet.⁴⁵ We are left to conclude that the material origins of the doublet seem to lie in the late seventeenth century, but it is quite possible that its manufacture was later. There is nothing to suggest that it is uniquely a garment belonging to Charles II. However, it is perhaps worth adding that, having taken a pattern from the doublet, the present author constructed a copy in toile and it was clear that by testing it on body of similar height to Charles II (6 feet 2 inches tall) the doublet would fit such a figure.⁴⁶

THE TRUNK HOSE (WA 0894.9): Figures 8 and 9

Trunk hose are seemingly an archaic form of dress, but like the doublet, they were first introduced by Charles II as part of the underdress of a knight of the Garter. The design of the trunk hose has been described elsewhere, but in essence it seems that the earliest trunk hose had a division for the legs, while later hose, like these, took the form of a short petticoat with no division for the legs.⁴⁷ This type simply wrapped around the waist and hips. Another, similar set of hose, the underdress of a Knight of the Thistle, survives at Drummond Castle, and dates from the period 1689-1716.⁴⁸ This confirms that the design was quite deliberate and not merely an adaptation for dressing the effigy. In fact this stylised form of trunk hose continued as part of the underdress into the nineteenth century, before being dropped in favour of contemporary formal clothing.⁴⁹

The cloth of silver from which the hose are made, is the same as that used for the doublet. The hose are cut deep and then made to form a puffed appearance by the use of a shorter white silk taffeta lining. At one end there is a buttonholed flap, and at the other a corresponding set of buttons. This arrangement is like the fly fastening found on breeches of the seventeenth century. In the centre of the garment, at the waist, there is a waistband division which fastens with a button. Along the bottom edge of the main section of the hose has been set a strip of buckram interlining. The bottom edge has then been darted (sewn pleats) all the way along its length. This allows the hem circumference to be narrowed dramatically and also to help create the puffed effect. This is a technique that is found in earlier seventeenth century tailoring.⁵⁰ The fabric at both lower corners of the main section is also pleated to reduce the vertical length (waist to crotch) and this helps create the puffed effect. Along the bottom edge runs a pelmet-like strip of cloth of silver. The hose are trimmed with vertical bands of silver braid and silver passementerie buttons. A white silk taffeta, still remarkably strong, is used for the pocket bags, the lining of the main trunk section, the lower pelmet piece and the fly piece. The edges of the fly opening, the fly piece and pocket openings are all bound in ribbed white silk braid.

What is interesting about this set of hose are the similarities shared with the construction of the earlier, bifurcated pair belonging to Charles Stuart. The same technique of pleating or darting the fabric to shorten the circumference and the deep pleats to shorten the crotch length are common to both. While the waistband shows on the outside, on the inside the silk taffeta lining has been pulled up over the reverse side of the waistband and anchored along the top edge. This is just as was found in the Charles Stuart breeches.⁵¹ What is noticeably different, after taking a pattern of the garment, is that the present set has been shaped to allow more fabric over the hips, while the Charles Stuart hose was cut from simple rectangles, with no extra shaping at the hips.

Like the doublet, the surviving trimmings - decorative strips of silver lace and buttons and the few bunches of silk ribbons on the waist and on the lower pelmet – are consistent with a date in the late seventeenth century.⁵² There were almost certainly many more bunches of ribbons set along the waist and also the lower edge as the two comparable examples and many portraits show. In the Charles Stuart trunk hose, there were twenty bunches of ribbons on the waistband tier and a further thirty-five bunches of ribbons on the bottom tier. In the present set, only two of the original bunches of ribbons survive on the waistband and a further three on the lower pelmet.⁵³

THE DRAWERS (WA 0894.10): Figure 10

Being of silk, rather than linen or wool, the drawers were almost certainly designed for ceremonial dress alone. Their extreme brevity also sets them apart; short trunk hose had long vanished from men's fashions and the style only survived in the ceremonial dress associated with the orders of Knighthood. The underdress of short trunk hose introduced by Charles II necessitated the wearing of very long stockings, reaching up to the thigh, so high that gartering would not have been a practical means of support. The solution was to sew the stockings and drawers together.

The drawers are not made from simple geometric shapes but are more skilfully crafted in terms of their cut. There is very pronounced arched shaping of the pattern to accommodate the difference between the width of fabric at the waist and the width of fabric around the thigh. Each leg is cut from a single piece of silk, the top edge of which is pleated towards the centre front (eight pleats on each side), the bottom edge of which is hemmed and gathered to fit the stocking top, around 55cm. There is a simple front opening, without any fly piece, just narrowly hemmed edges, while the back is seamed together, almost to the waist, except for the last 3cms, where the back divides. Each half is

completed by a narrow waistband of a folded strip of silk, stitched along its mid-length to stop rolling, and at the back finished with an eyelet hole to allow a ribbon tie to adjust fastening of the waistband. At the front there is a silk covered button (1.1 cm) and buttonhole fastening at the fly opening. The only other pair like this and of similar date, are those that survive at Drummond Castle, as part of the underdress of the Order of the Thistle.⁵⁴ This arrangement – the stockings and drawers ‘united like pantaloons’ - seems to have continued to the early nineteenth century, at least.⁵⁵

THE SHIRT (WA 0894.15): Figure 11

The shirt is of fine white linen, cut full in the body and the sleeves, using the full loom width (91 cm) and is finely gathered into bands at the neck and at the wrists. The shirt is described as a half-shirt by C W and Phillis Cunnington in their *History of Underclothes*. Half-shirts were shirts that in all other respects were the same as ‘whole shirts’, but merely lacked length – they reached to the hips, but not to the knees. They seem also to be associated with wear in warm weather.⁵⁶ Charles II certainly had half shirts as they feature in his clothing records.⁵⁷ Measurement of this shirt shows a length of 108 cm, which falls mid-thigh and it would require around 4 yards of linen, unlike some half-shirts which are recorded to require 2 ½ yards of linen. There has been mutilation of the shirt in the past, but these cuts have been underlaid and repaired so that the shirt’s dimensions and construction are little affected. The shirt pattern is similar to that recorded for an earlier seventeenth-century shirt, that of Admiral Claes Bielkenstierna (1615-1662), c.1659.⁵⁸ The shirt body is cut from a continuous length of linen, with a T-shaped cut in the centre, which provides the neck opening. The narrow neckband has two buttonholes on the left, which fastened to two buttons on the right, although the original buttons do not survive. The narrow wristbands each have four buttonholes distributed along their length for the attachment of separate ruffled bands. A strip of lace is attached to the lower half of the

central front opening. Extra shaping is achieved, as is characteristic of shirt construction at this time by the use of underarm gussets, although there are no neckline gussets. There are narrow reinforcing strips of linen running along the shoulders. There is also a small reinforcing patch of linen at the base of the centre front opening. The pattern of buttonholes on the shirt wristbands matches those on the detachable ruffled bands.

Comparison with the Bielkenstierna shirt suggests that a date in the late seventeenth century is quite possible. However, although the trimming on the shirt front is a late seventeenth century needle lace, probably Italian, it has been ‘restored’ at some later date.⁵⁹ It is almost certainly a later addition to the shirt. The fact that it is only attached to the lower half of the centre front opening is also atypical. Late seventeenth century shirts which have lace trimming around the centre front, have it along both edges for the whole length of the opening.

THE CRAVAT (WA 0894.18)

The illustration in Dart’s *Westmonasterium* shows the effigy of Charles II with a simple lace ended cravat (Figure 3). The late nineteenth century photographs of the Charles II effigy in its wainscot cupboard also show a simple cravat with no bow attachment, only the lace ends hanging down. This cravat seems not to have been original and its appearance, isolated from the figure, was recorded by the Victoria and Albert Museum during the 1933-34 conservation.⁶⁰ However, since then, the lace from this cravat was taken and recycled in the preparation of a new cravat during the 1986 conservation. £40 was paid for the making of this new cravat, with museum curator Avril Hart guiding the design of the new neckwear. This commissioned cravat is a bias cut rectangle of white cotton, with hemmed edges and to its shorter ends two salvaged pieces of raised needle lace have been attached. It is also at this time that we first see the appearance of a cravat

with bow. This is recorded in the cover photo of Harvey and Mortimer's account, published in 1994; the photograph taken after the conservation of 1933-34 shows no additional bow.

Is anything about the present cravat 'authentic'? Examining the lace, Clare Browne says that 'the individual motifs are needle lace, and likely to be seventeenth century (c.1680s), and probably Italian, but the piece has been 'tidied up', probably in the nineteenth century'.⁶¹ Although the lace may originate in the seventeenth century, it has been heavily re-worked, strongly suggesting that it was not part of the original clothing of the effigy. The construction of the cravat, as revealed in the photograph from 1933-34, shows something that bears no relation to authentic cravats of the late seventeenth century. Emily Tennyson Bradley's remark in the *Annals of Westminster Abbey* suggests that there had been an eighteenth century intervention which added lace details to the figure.⁶² A late portrait of Charles II made for Christ's Hospital London and attributed to Marcellus Laroon (1653-1702), depicts the king wearing a lace cravat with bow.⁶³ Was this painting a source idea for the arrangement that was worked out in 1986, for the new display in the Undercroft Museum?

THE SHIRT CUFF RUFFLES (WA 0894.24-25)

To the shirt wristbands are attached lace ruffles; each band has four buttonholes, one at either end of the narrow band and a further pair in the middle. This pattern is matched by the buttonholes that are worked on both of the ruffled lace bands. Each band is formed of three tiers of lace, and the lace is like that of the cravat and the shirt front. It is a raised needle lace, quite heavy, Venetian in style although possibly made in London, according to Santina Levey.⁶⁴ The cuffs have been very finely made, apart from the raw ends of the lace. The lace, like that of the cravat and the strip applied to the shirt front, has been

patched up and it is difficult to be sure of its authenticity in relation to the original clothing of the effigy. Comparable detachable lace cuff ruffles are to be found in the Victoria and Albert Museum, at Rosenborg Castle, Copenhagen and at the Livrustkammaren, Stockholm.⁶⁵ Venetian lace was expensive and a mark of wealth and status. In order to protect the English lace industry, a ban on its import was introduced in 1662, although royalty were exempt and continued to import and wear it.⁶⁶

THE SWORD GIRDLE (WA 0894.23): Figure 9

The sword belt and carrier has several pieces: a waist belt, two frogs, two short straps and one longer strap. There are also several metal pieces which join the belt and straps, with suspension hooks linking with eyelets attached to sliders on the waist belt. The belt and straps are of leather, covered with dark blue silk velvet which has been seamed at the back of each strap. The edges are decorated with a short, dense fringing of silver gilt. Similarly, the frogs are made of leather covered in velvet and edged in silver gilt fringing. There is no comment in Ashmole on the wearing and design of this accessory.

There is not enough of an established typology of these ceremonial objects from which to date this specimen. The Royal Armouries Leeds could only offer an approximate date in the late seventeenth century, suggesting 1660-85.⁶⁷ Examination of a number of paintings and engravings of knights of the Garter, from the late seventeenth century, where the sword girdle is clearly shown, reveals a match with the design of the surviving sword belt and carrier. It seems that it was more frequently made in red silk velvet to match the surcoat and hood. In the portraits, the long velvet streamer attached to the hood is twisted through the waist belt to hold it in place. Nevertheless there are paintings which show a blue velvet sword girdle, for example, in a painting by Sir Peter Lely (1618-1680) of General George Monck, 1st Duke of Albemarle (1608-1670).⁶⁸

CONCLUSION

After examination of the garments that survive on the effigy of Charles II, what can be deduced? The burglary at the Abbey around 1700, when the figure was robbed of its ornaments makes it difficult to say with confidence that the figure was just as that installed around 1686. However the illustration in Dart's *Westmonasterium* of 1723 also suggests that the appearance of the effigy has remained relatively stable over the centuries since then, probably as a result of the protection of the glass case. We can reasonably attribute the garments to the late seventeenth century, from the period of the king's death to the turn of the century (1685-1700). The construction of the doublet, with its cutaway front and its unusual stiffening, does not conform to known examples, but the materials and trimmings are consistent with production in the late seventeenth century. The style and materials of the trunk hose also suggest the same date. The surcoat is shorter than described for the sovereign, Charles II, in Ashmole's account. The mantle, most notably, conforms to the statutes for a monarch found in Ashmole's *Institution* of 1672 and so it seems possible that this is the one garment that might with more certainty be said to have belonged to the king. The ceremonial hood and cap with plumes seem genuinely late seventeenth century and are exactly as recorded in drawings and paintings of the period. The linen shirt conforms in cut and construction to one from the late seventeenth century, but the lace used to trim it, although seventeenth century in pattern and construction, shows signs of later repair and seems likely, from the way it has been applied in untypical ways, to be a later intervention. It must be stressed that the clothes are all well-tailored and are not skimpy in construction, pointing to their manufacture for a real patron. Was that client Charles II? That is harder to say. The clothes may have come from diverse sources. The shirt and shoes are inferior and seem unlikely to have belonged to Charles II, but the ceremonial clothes fit the effigy which has a height similar to that of Charles II who was recorded as a

tall man. Although there is no evidence to support the assertion that the clothes belonged to Charles II, there remains the possibility that some of them did.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would like to thank Dr Susan Jenkins, Christine Reynolds, Alison Foster and Tom O’Keeffe at Westminster Abbey for their generous assistance during the research and development of this project. Thanks also to Zenzie Tinker, the principal textiles conservator for the clothing, who helped greatly with photographs and information and to Rachel Rhodes of the conservation team. The author would like to thank Clare Browne, former Curator of Textiles at the Victoria and Albert Museum, London and Henry Yallop at the Royal Armouries, Leeds, for their patience in answering enquiries, and for their help with information towards the dating of materials.

DAVID WILCOX teaches on the Performance Costume design course at Edinburgh College of Art, part of the University of Edinburgh since 2011. He also researches the cut of European men’s clothing from surviving examples, examining and mapping garments for their cut and construction. His period of interest stretches from the early seventeenth century through to the mid-nineteenth century.

¹ Anthony Harvey and Richard Mortimer, *The Funeral Effigies of Westminster Abbey* (London: The Boydell Press, 1994), p.79.

² Raymond Crawford, *The Last Days of Charles II* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1909), pp. 35-43.

Crawford, a physician and medical historian, used eyewitness accounts from a range of sources to construct a narrative of the last days of Charles II.

³ Paul S. Fritz, 'From 'Public' to 'Private': the Royal funeral in England, 1500-1830', *Mirrors of Mortality: Studies in the Social History of Death* (London: Europa, 1981), pp.69-71.

⁴ Jennifer Woodward, *The Theatre of Death: The Ritual Management of Royal Funerals in Renaissance England, 1570-1625* (London: The Boydell Press, 1997), p.201.

⁵ Harvey and Mortimer, *The Funeral Effigies of Westminster Abbey*, p.79

⁶ Ibid. pp.26-7.

⁷ Ibid. p.28.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Elias Ashmole, *The Institution, Laws and Ceremonies of the Most Noble Order of the Garter* (London: Nathaneal Brooke, 1672). Re-printed in a facsimile edition by Frederick Muller, Fleet Street, London in 1971.

¹⁰ *Flying Post or The Post Master* (London, England), January 27, 1700 - January 30, 1700; Issue 737. *17th-18th Century Burney Collection Newspapers*. 'On Wednesday Night [...] some Villains took the opportunity of lurking behind in King Henry VII's Chapel, and breaking into King Charles II's Tomb, disrob'd his Effigies of all its Ornaments and carried them off.'

¹¹ Strickland, A. and Strickland, E. (1854) 'CHAPTER II', in *Lives of the Queens of England from the Norman Conquest*.: Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, (pp. 46-91) p.84.

¹² Paul S. Fritz, 'The Trade in Death: The Royal Funerals in England, 1685-1830', *Eighteenth-Century Studies* Vol. 15, No. 3 (Spring, 1982), (291-316), p.296.

¹³ Emily Tennyson Bradley, *Annals of Westminster Abbey* (London: Cassell & Co. Ltd., 1895), p.300.

¹⁴ David Wilcox, A Suit of Silver: The Underdress of a Knight of the Garter in the Late Seventeenth Century, *Costume* 48 (1), 2014, pp.21-45. This essay describes a set of underdress belonging to Charles Stuart, Third Duke of Richmond and Sixth Duke of Lennox (1639-1672).

¹⁵ See Harvey and Mortimer, *The Funeral Effigies of Westminster Abbey*, pp.92-3, for June Swann's detailed description of the shoes. She concludes that they were inferior shoes, unlikely to have belonged to Charles II.

¹⁶ Harvey and Mortimer, *The Funeral Effigies of Westminster Abbey*, pp. 80, 92.

¹⁷ John Dart, *Westmonasterium, Or the history and antiquities of the Abbey Church of St. Peters Westminster [...] in 2 vol.* (London: printed & sold by James Cole, Joseph Smith, Tho. Bowles, Jer. Batley, Tho. Taylor, John Bowles, and by Andrew Johnstone, 1723), p.153.

¹⁸ For detailed description of the dress and insignia see: Alan Mansfield, *Ceremonial Costume* (London: A & C Black, 1980), pp.46-61.

¹⁹ Lennoxlove House, Haddington, East Lothian, Scotland, EH41 4NZ. Some account of this is given in Wilcox, 'A Suit of Silver', pp.21-45.

²⁰ Ashmole, *The Institution, Laws and Ceremonies of the Most Noble Order of the Garter*, p.211.

²¹ Mansfield, *Ceremonial Costume*, p.50: less than 18 yards might be used to make a mantle; the Earl of Bedford received fifteen yards of blue velvet and the same of white taffeta, for his mantle in 1672. Measurement of Charles Stuart's mantle (c1661-1672) showed that it could be constructed from 15 yards.

²² Ashmole, *The Institution, Laws and Ceremonies of the Most Noble Order of the Garter*, p.211.

²³ Dart, *Westmonasterium*, p.153.

²⁴ The engraving of Charles II by William Sherwin features as a frontispiece to Ashmole. Drawings by Sir Peter Lely of Knights of the Garter in full costume can be viewed online at the Royal Collection: <https://www.royalcollection.org.uk/>.

²⁵ Ashmole, *The Institution, Laws and Ceremonies of the Most Noble Order of the Garter*, p.210.

²⁶ Janet Arnold, 'The Kirtle, or Surcoat, and Mantle of the Most Noble Order of the Garter Worn by Christian IV, King of Denmark and Norway', *The Antiquaries Journal*, 72, (1992), pp. 141–167.

Janet Arnold, 'A Prelate's Robe for the Most Noble Order of the Garter worn by the Right Reverend Sir Jonathan Trelawny, 3rd Bart., Lord Bishop of Winchester, in 1707', *Costume* 28 (1), 1994, pp.22-36.

²⁷ Harvey and Mortimer, *The Funeral Effigies of Westminster Abbey*, p.83.

²⁸ Ashmole, *The Institution, Laws and Ceremonies of the Most Noble Order of the Garter*, p.211.

²⁹ The longer kirtle or surcoat worn by knights of the Garter can be seen in many portraits, notably James I, painted 1621 by Daniel Mytens (NPG 109) and Henry, Prince of Wales painted 1603 by Marcus Gheeraets the Younger (NPG 1562).

³⁰ Arnold, 'The Kirtle, or Surcoat, and Mantle of the Most Noble Order of the Garter worn by Christian IV, King of Denmark and Norway', pp141 - 167.

³¹ Ashmole, *The Institution, Laws and Ceremonies of the Most Noble Order of the Garter*, p.213

³² Ibid.

³³ For example, see the portrait of General George Monck by Sir Peter Lely in the Scottish National Portrait Gallery, Edinburgh, PG 900.

³⁴ Personal correspondence with Rachel Rhodes of the effigy conservation team (17.11.2017).

³⁵ Ashmole, *The Institution, Laws and Ceremonies of the Most Noble Order of the Garter*, p.215.

³⁶ A comparable, earlier example can be seen in Janet Arnold, *Patterns of Fashion: the cut and construction of clothes for men and women c1560-1620* (London: Macmillan, 1985), pp. 34, 94, (pattern 28).

³⁷ These drawings can be viewed at the Royal Collection website

<<https://www.royalcollection.org.uk/collection>> and at the Hermitage website

<<https://www.hermitagemuseum.org/wps/portal/hermitage/?lng=en>>.

³⁸ For example, see the portrait of Laurence Hyde (1642 – 1711), Earl of Rochester painted c.1686 by Willem Wissing (1656-1687), in the Holburne Museum, Bath.

³⁹ Harvey and Mortimer, *The Funeral Effigies of Westminster Abbey*, p. 92.

⁴⁰ Wilcox, 'A Suit of Silver: The Underdress of a Knight of the Garter in the Late Seventeenth Century', pp.21-45.

⁴¹ Ashmole, *The Institution, Laws and Ceremonies of the Most Noble Order of the Garter*, Appendix, Num. CLXXX: An Order for the fashion and materials of the Sovereign and Knights-Companions Under Habit.

⁴² Personal correspondence with Clare Browne, former Curator for Dress and Textiles, Victoria and Albert Museum. (11.12.2016).

⁴³ Ibid. Clare Browne suggests comparison with some earlier examples found on a pair of gloves, dated 1660-1680 (V & A object ref: T.229.1,2-1994).

⁴⁴ The doublet of Charles Stuart, sixth Duke of Lennox and third Duke of Richmond is in the collection of National Museums Scotland, Edinburgh, object A.1947.257 . See Wilcox, 'A Suit of Silver: The Underdress of a Knight of the Garter in the Late Seventeenth Century', pp.21-45. The doublet of James Drummond, fourth Earl of Perth, is in a private collection at Drummond Castle, Perthshire, Scotland. It has been written about by Hazel Reid: 'A Collection of Thistle Robes from Drummond Castle', *Costume*, 8(1), 1974, pp. 51-55.

⁴⁵ Mansfield, *Ceremonial Costume*, p.60.

-
- ⁴⁶ Antonia Fraser, *King Charles II* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson, 1979), p.12.
- ⁴⁷ For detailed description and cutting diagram of Charles Stuart's trunk hose see Wilcox, 'A Suit of Silver: The Underdress of a Knight of the Garter in the Late Seventeenth Century', pp.21-45.
- ⁴⁸ Reid, 'A Collection of Thistle Robes from Drummond Castle', pp. 51-55.
- ⁴⁹ Mansfield, *Ceremonial Costume*, pp.60-61.
- ⁵⁰ Arnold, *Patterns of Fashion: The cut and construction of clothes for men and women c1560-1620*, pp.74-77.
- ⁵¹ Wilcox, 'A Suit of Silver: The Underdress of a Knight of the Garter in the Late Seventeenth Century', pp.36-40.
- ⁵² Personal correspondence with Clare Browne (11.12.2016).
- ⁵³ During the 2016-17 conservation, it was decided to re-instate the original design and apply new, carefully matched bunches of ribbons along the waistband and under the pleats on the lower edge.
- ⁵⁴ Reid, 'A Collection of Thistle Robes from Drummond Castle', pp. 51-55.
- ⁵⁵ Mansfield, *Ceremonial Costume*, pp. 60-61.
- ⁵⁶ C.Willett & Phillis Cunnington, *The History of Underclothes* (London: Faber & Faber, 1981), pp.41-42. Pepys records putting on the first half shirt of the summer (1664). Two students buy half shirts for their Grand Tour (1670).
- ⁵⁷ Hayward, Maria. "Dressing Charles II: The King's Clothing Choices (1660–85)." *Apparence (s)* 6 (2015), p.163. Seamstress's bill for making half shirts for the king.
- ⁵⁸ Janet Arnold, *Patterns of Fashion 4: the cut and construction of linen shirts, smocks, neckwear, headwear and accessories for men and women* (London: Macmillan, 2008), pp.74-75.
- ⁵⁹ Personal correspondence with Clare Browne (11.12.2016).
- ⁶⁰ Harvey and Mortimer, *The Funeral Effigies of Westminster Abbey*, p.89.
- ⁶¹ Personal correspondence with Clare Browne (11.12.2016).
- ⁶² Emily Tennyson Bradley, *Annals of Westminster Abbey*, p.300.
- ⁶³ The portrait of Charles II attributed to Marcellus Laroon (1653-1702) is at Christ's Hospital, Horsham, West Sussex.
- ⁶⁴ Harvey and Mortimer, *The Funeral Effigies of Westminster Abbey*, p.92

⁶⁵ Victoria & Albert Museum: object no. T.6B&C-1963. See also Lena Rangstöm, *Modelejon Manligt Mode 1500-tal 1600-tal 1700-tal* (Stockholm: Livrustkammaren, 2002), pp. 151,152,166,352,358.

⁶⁶ Victoria & Albert Museum: catalogue entry for lace cravat, c.1670: object no. T.41-1947.

⁶⁷ Henry Yallop at The Royal Armouries, Leeds, personal communication (21.02.2017). Clare Browne also thought that the structure of the fringe, and the metal thread, looked plausible for c.1685. Personal communication (11.12.2016).

⁶⁸ Portrait of Sir George Monck by Sir Peter Lely, painted after 1660. National Portrait Gallery of Scotland, PG 900.